



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,457	11/24/2003	Cha Deok Dong	29936/39764	4077

4743 7590 10/18/2006

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP  
233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300  
SEARS TOWER  
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

TRINH, MICHAEL MANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2822

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/720,457		DONG, CHA DEOK	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Michael Trinh		2822	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

\*\*\* This office action is in response to Applicant's Amendment filed July 24, 2006. Claims 1-14 are pending.

\*\*\* The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wu (2002/0115270).

Wu teaches a method for forming a device isolation film in a semiconductor device, comprising the steps of: forming an active region on which ions 102 are implanted for controlling a threshold voltage on a surface of a semiconductor substrate 100 (Figs 3A,3C, paragraph 0014), wherein as shown in Figure 3C, the active region is considered as a region located under both the pad oxide layer 101a and the extended buffer spacers 104a; forming a trench having sidewall to define a device isolation region by etching a portion of the semiconductor substrate of a device isolation region (Figs 3B-3C; paragraph 0016); forming a side wall oxidation film 105 at the side wall of the trench by performing an oxidation process (Fig 3D; paragraph 0016); performing a second ion implantation 102b on the active region at the trench sidewall surface to compensate for the ions for controlling a threshold voltage, which ions are diffused from the active region, inherently, during the step of thermally growing the sidewall oxidation film 105 (Figure 3D; paragraph 0016); and forming a device isolation film 106 by burying the oxidation film inside the trench (Figs 3E-3F, paragraph 0017; Figs 4A-4F, paragraphs 0020-0021). Re claim 5, wherein boron is used as an ion for implanting to control the threshold voltage (paragraph 0014).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gardner (5,985,743) taken with Oda et al (2002/0086498).

Re claim 1, Gardner teaches a method for forming a device isolation film in a semiconductor device, comprising the steps of: forming an active region on which ions are

Art Unit: 2822

implanted for controlling a threshold voltage on a surface of a semiconductor substrate (Figs 5-6; col 8, line 55 through col 9, line 33; col 8, line 21 through col 11); forming a trench having sidewall to define a device isolation region by etching a portion of the semiconductor substrate of a device isolation region (Fig 7; col 12, lines 20-54); and forming a device isolation film 146 by burying the oxidation film inside the trench (col 12, lines 20-54; Fig 7).

Re claim 1, Gardner lacks forming a side wall oxidation film at the trench side wall, and performing a ion implantation on the active region at the sidewall to compensate for the ions for controlling a threshold voltage. Re claim 5, ions include boron.

However, re claim 1, Oda teach (at Fig 3; paragraphs 46, 44-47; Figs 1-4) forming a device isolation film by forming a side wall oxidation film 5 at the trench side wall, and performing a ion implantation on the active region at the sidewall to compensate for the ions for controlling a threshold voltage, which ions are diffused from the active region (Figs 1-4; paragraphs 46,44-47, 10,15,20), wherein, re claim 5, the ions include boron (paragraph 46).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the semiconductor device of Gardner by forming a side wall oxidation film at the trench side wall and performing an ion implantation on the active region at the sidewall to compensate for the boron ions for controlling a threshold voltage, as taught by Oda. This is because of the desirability to compensate for the reduction of ions for controlling a threshold voltage resulting from diffusion of the ions.

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Wu 2002/0115270) or Gardner (5,985,743) taken with Oda et al (2002/0086498).

Wu or Garner/Oda teach a method for forming a device isolation film in a semiconductor device, as applied to claim 1 above.

Re claim 2, Wu already teaches performing an oxidation to form the sidewall oxidation film 105 having a thickness in a range of 50 to 150 Angstroms. Wu or Gardner does not mention the oxidation to round an upper portion or bottom corner of the trench.

However, Oda et al teach (at Figs 2, paragraph 0045; Figs 3-9; paragraphs 0046-0052) when forming the trench, the side wall oxidation film 5 formed by oxidation to perform a rounding treatment to round on an upper corner portion of the trench, and to suppress fluctuation

Art Unit: 2822

of a threshold voltage in an upper corner portion of the trench isolation (paragraphs 0017-0021), wherein bottom corners of the trench is inherently rounded during the same oxidation step, and wherein an adhesive strength of the oxidation film to be buried inside the trench is also inherently increased due to the formation of the sidewall oxidation film.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the device isolation film in a semiconductor device of Wu or Gardner by rounding the upper portion or corners of the trench at the same time during the oxidation step to the sidewall oxidation film as taught by Oda. This is at least because of the desirability to suppress fluctuation of a threshold voltage in an upper corner portion of the trench isolation. Also, the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the portion of the prior art's range of thickness in a range of 50 to 150 Angstroms, which is within the range of applicant's claims, because it has been held to be obvious to select a value in a known range by optimization for the best results, and would be an unpatentable modification, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation". *In Re Aller* 104 USPQ 233,255 (CCPA 1955); *In re Waite* 77 USPQ 586 (CCPA 1948); *In Re Swanson* 56 USPQ 372 (CCPA 1942); *In Re Sola* 25 USPQ 433 (CCPA 1935); and *In Re Dreyfus* 24 USPQ 52 (CCPA 1934).

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Wu 2002/0115270 or Gardner (5,985,743) and Oda et al (2002/0086498), taken with Hong (6,030,882).

Wu or Gardner/Oda teach a method for forming a device isolation film in a semiconductor device, as applied to claim 1 above.

Re claim 3, Wu or Gardner/Oda already teaches performing an oxidation to form the sidewall oxidation film, but lacks mentioning by a dry oxidation at a temperature of 800-900°C.

However, Hong teaches (at Figs 2C-2D; col 4, lines 13-25) forming a sidewall oxidation film 218 on sidewalls of the trench by dry oxidation at a temperature of about 900°C.

Therefore, the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the portion of the prior art's range of

Art Unit: 2822

temperature of about 900°C in the dry oxidation to form the sidewall oxidation film on sidewalls of the trench, as disclosed by Hong, which temperature is within the range of applicant's claims, because it has been held to be obvious to select a value in a known range by optimization for the best results, wherein the implanted ions are prohibiting from diffusion at that temperature, and would be an unpatentable modification, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation”, *In Re Aller* 104 USPQ 233,255 (CCPA 1955); *In re Waite* 77 USPQ 586 (CCPA 1948); *In Re Swanson* 56 USPQ 372 (CCPA 1942); and *In Re Dreyfus* 24 USPQ 52 (CCPA 1934); wherein the dry oxidation is effectively process for forming a thin uniform sidewall oxidation film on the sidewalls of the trench as a liner oxide layer.

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Wu 2002/0115270 or Gardner (5,985,743) and Oda et al (2002/0086498) taken with Oda et al (2002/0086498).

Wu or Gardner/Oda teaches a method for forming a device isolation film in a semiconductor device, as applied to claim 1 above.

Re claims 4-5, Wu already teaches performing an ion implantation process on an active region after the oxidation process, but lack mentioning the implantation at a dose of  $1E11$  to  $1E12$  ion/cm<sup>2</sup> in an energy band of 10 Kev to 25 Kev.

However, Oda teaches performing an ion implantation process on an active region after the oxidation process, wherein the implantation is performed at a dose of  $5E11$  to  $1E14$  ion/cm<sup>2</sup> in an energy band of 10 Kev to 30 Kev.

Therefore, the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform the ion implantation of Wu or Gardner/Oda by selecting the portion of the prior art's range of dose and energy, as disclosed by Oda, which is within the range of applicant's claims, because it has been held to be obvious to select a value in a known range by optimization for the best results, and would be an unpatentable modification, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation”. *In*

Art Unit: 2822

*Re Aller* 104 USPQ 233,255 (CCPA 1955); *In re Waite* 77 USPQ 586 (CCPA 1948); *In Re Swanson* 56 USPQ 372 (CCPA 1942); and *In Re Dreyfus* 24 USPQ 52 (CCPA 1934).

6. Claims 6,14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wu (2002/0115270) taken with Sung (5,550,078).

Wu teaches a method for forming a device isolation film in a semiconductor device, comprising the steps of: performing a first ion implantation (102 in Fig 3A; 200 in Fig 4A) for controlling a threshold voltage on a surface of a semiconductor substrate 100 (Fig 3A, paragraph 0014; Fig 4A, paragraph 0020); sequentially forming a gate oxide film 201, a polysilicon film 202, and a pad nitride 203 on the semiconductor substrate 100 (Fig 4A; paragraphs 0020); forming a trench having sidewall to define an active region and a device isolation region by etching a portion of the semiconductor substrate of a device isolation region (Figs 3B-3C; paragraph 0016; Fig 3D; paragraph 0020); forming a side wall oxidation film (105 in Fig 3D; 205 in Fig 4D) at the side wall of the trench by performing an oxidation process (Fig 3D; paragraph 0016; Figs 4D-4F; paragraphs 20-21); performing a second ion implantation (102b in Fig 3D; 200b in Fig 4D) into a whole active region at the trench sidewall surface to compensate for an ion concentration of the active region (Fig 3D; paragraph 0016; Fig 4D); removing the pad nitride 203a (paragraph 0022); and forming a device isolation film (106 in Fig 3E; 206 in Fig 4E) by burying the oxidation film inside the trench (Figs 3E-3F, paragraph 0017; Figs 4A-4F, paragraphs 0020-0021). Re claim 14, wherein boron is used as an ion for implanting to control the threshold voltage (paragraphs 0014 and 20).

Wu teaches ion implanting to form threshold voltage (Fig 4A), but does not clearly mention forming a screen oxide film before implantation and removing it thereafter.

However, Sung teaches (at Figs 4-6; col 5, line 55-67; col 6) forming a screen oxide film 9 to protect the semiconductor substrate (Fig 5); performing an ion implantation for controlling a threshold voltage 10; and removing the screen oxide film 9 thereafter.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform an ion implantation for controlling a threshold voltage of Wu by forming a screen oxide film before ion implantation and removing it thereafter, as taught by

Sung. This is because of the desirability to protect the semiconductor substrate from damaging due to the ion implantation.

7. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu (2002/0115270) and Sung (5,550,078), as applied to claim 6 above, taken with Oda et al (2002/0086498).

Wu and Sung teach a method for forming a device isolation film in a semiconductor device, as applied to claim 6 above.

Re claim 11, Wu already teaches performing an oxidation to form the sidewall oxidation film 105 having a thickness in a range of 50 to 150 Angstroms. Wu does not mention the oxidation to round an upper portion or bottom corner of the trench.

However, Oda et al teach (at Figs 2, paragraph 0045; Figs 3-9; paragraphs 0046-0052) when forming the trench, the side wall oxidation film 5 formed by oxidation to perform a rounding treatment to round on an upper corner portion of the trench, and to suppress fluctuation of a threshold voltage in an upper corner portion of the trench isolation (paragraphs 0017-0021), wherein bottom corners of the trench is inherently rounded during the same oxidation step, and wherein an adhesive strength of the oxidation film to be buried inside the trench is also inherently increased due to the formation of the sidewall oxidation film.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the device isolation film in a semiconductor device of Wu by rounding the upper portion or corners of the trench at the same time during the oxidation step to the sidewall oxidation film as taught by Oda. This is at least because of the desirability to suppress fluctuation of a threshold voltage in an upper corner portion of the trench isolation. Also, the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the portion of the prior art's range of thickness in a range of 50 to 150 Angstroms, as disclosed by Wu, which is within the range of applicant's claims, because it has been held to be obvious to select a value in a known range by optimization for the best results, and would be an unpatentable modification, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation". *In Re Aller* 104 USPQ 233,255 (CCPA 1955); *In re Waite* 77 USPQ



Art Unit: 2822

586 (CCPA 1948); *In Re Swanson* 56 USPQ 372 (CCPA 1942); *In Re Sola* 25 USPQ 433 (CCPA 1935); and *In Re Dreyfus* 24 USPQ 52 (CCPA 1934).

8. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu (2002/0115270) and Sung (5,550,078), as applied to claim 6 above, taken with Hong (6,030,882).

Wu and Sung teach a method for forming a device isolation film in a semiconductor device, as applied to claim 6 above.

Re claim 12, Wu already teaches performing an oxidation to form the sidewall oxidation film, but lacks mentioning by a dry oxidation at a temperature of 800-900°C.

However, Hong teaches (at Figs 2C-2D; col 4, lines 13-25) forming a sidewall oxidation film 218 on sidewalls of the trench by dry oxidation at a temperature of about 900°C.

Therefore, the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the portion of the prior art's range of temperature of about 900°C in the dry oxidation to form the sidewall oxidation film on sidewalls of the trench, as disclosed by Hong, which temperature is within the range of applicant's claims, because it has been held to be obvious to select a value in a known range by optimization for the best results, wherein the implanted ions are prohibiting from diffusion at that temperature, and would be an unpatentable modification, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation", *In Re Aller* 104 USPQ 233,255 (CCPA 1955); *In re Waite* 77 USPQ 586 (CCPA 1948); *In Re Swanson* 56 USPQ 372 (CCPA 1942); and *In Re Dreyfus* 24 USPQ 52 (CCPA 1934); wherein the dry oxidation is effectively process for forming a thin uniform sidewall oxidation film on the sidewalls of the trench as a liner oxide layer.

9. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu (2002/0115270) and Sung (5,550,078), as applied to claim 6 above, taken with Oda et al (2002/0086498).

Wu and Sung teach a method for forming a device isolation film in a semiconductor device, as applied to claim 6 above.

Art Unit: 2822

Re claim 13, Wu already teaches performing an ion implantation process on an active region after the oxidation process, but lack mentioning the implantation at a dose of  $1E11$  to  $1E12$  ion/cm<sup>2</sup> in an energy band of 10 Kev to 25 Kev.

However, Oda teaches performing an ion implantation process on an active region after the oxidation process, wherein the implantation is performed at a dose of  $5E11$  to  $1E14$  ion/cm<sup>2</sup> in an energy band of 10 Kev to 30 Kev.

Therefore, the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform the ion implantation of Wu by selecting the portion of the prior art's range of dose and energy, as disclosed by Oda, which is within the range of applicant's claims, because it has been held to be obvious to select a value in a known range by optimization for the best results, and would be an unpatentable modification, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation". *In Re Aller* 104 USPQ 233,255 (CCPA 1955); *In re Waite* 77 USPQ 586 (CCPA 1948); *In Re Swanson* 56 USPQ 372 (CCPA 1942); and *In Re Dreyfus* 24 USPQ 52 (CCPA 1934).

10. Claims 7,10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu (2002/0115270) and Sung (5,550,078), as applied to claim 6 above, and further of Houlihan (2001/0021545) or Dong (2003/0119256).

The references including Wu and Sung teach a method for forming a device isolation film in a semiconductor device, as applied to claim 6 above.

Re claims 7, the references teach forming the screen oxide, but lack mentioning thickness of about 50-70 Angstroms by wet or dry oxidation at 700-900° C. Re claim 10, Wu already teaches forming the pad nitride film 203 by low pressure chemical vapor deposition, but lack mentioning a thickness of about 900-2000Angstroms.

However, re claim 7, Sung already teaches forming a screen oxide film 9 having a thickness of about 150-250 Angstroms by thermal oxidation at 850-950° C (col 4, lines 55-65). Houlihan teaches (at col 4, lines 63-67) forming a screen oxide film 24 having a thickness of about 50-100 Angstroms. Re claim 10, Houlihan also teaches forming the pad nitride film 27 having a thickness of about 800-1000Angstroms (col 5, lines 12-15). Dong also teaches (at

Art Unit: 2822

paragraph 25) forming a screen oxide film 26 having a thickness of about 50-70 Angstroms by wet or dry oxidation at 700-900 °C (re claim 7), wherein a pad nitride 16 is formed by LPCVD (paragraph 13, re claim 10).

Therefore, the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform the screen oxide film and the pad nitride film of the references including Wu by selecting the portion of the prior art's range of thickness and temperature, as disclosed by Sung and Houlihan or Dong, which is within the range of applicant's claims, because it has been held to be obvious to select a value in a known range by optimization for the best results, and would be an unpatentable modification, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation". *In Re Aller* 104 USPQ 233,255 (CCPA 1955); *In re Waite* 77 USPQ 586 (CCPA 1948); *In Re Swanson* 56 USPQ 372 (CCPA 1942); and *In Re Dreyfus* 24 USPQ 52 (CCPA 1934).

11. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu (2002/0115270) and Sung (5,550,078), as applied to claim 6 above, and further of Kim (2003/0067050) and/or Dong (2003/0119256).

The references including Wu and Sung teach a method for forming a device isolation film in a semiconductor device, as applied to claim 6 above.

Re claim 8, the references including Wu teach forming the gate oxidation film, but lack detailing about thickness, annealing time and temperature.

However, Sung teaches forming a gate oxidation film by thermal grown at a temperature of about 850-950°C to a thickness up to 200 Angstroms (col 5, lines 8-12). Kim teaches (at paragraph 24) forming a high voltage gate oxide film having a thickness of 300-1000 Angstroms. Dong teaches (at paragraph 27) forming a tunnel gate oxide film 28 by wet oxidation at 750-800°C and nitrogen annealing at a temperature of 900-910°C for 20-30 minutes.

Therefore, the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform the gate oxide film of the references including Wu by selecting the portion of the prior art's range of thickness and temperature, as disclosed by Sung and Kim and/or Dong, which is within the range of applicant's claims, because

Art Unit: 2822

it has been held to be obvious to select a value in a known range by optimization for the best results, to form a high voltage transistor, and would be an unpatentable modification, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation". *In Re Aller* 104 USPQ 233,255 (CCPA 1955); *In re Waite* 77 USPQ 586 (CCPA 1948); *In Re Swanson* 56 USPQ 372 (CCPA 1942); and *In Re Dreyfus* 24 USPQ 52 (CCPA 1934).

12. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu (2002/0115270) and Sung (5,550,078), as applied to claim 6 above, and further of Sung et al (6,180,453) and/or Dong (2003/0119256).

The references including Wu and Sung teach a method for forming a device isolation film in a semiconductor device, as applied to claim 6 above.

Re claim 9, the references including Wu teach forming the polysilicon film 202, but lack detailing about thickness, gases, pressure, and temperature as recited in claim 9.

However, Sung '078 teaches (col 5, lines 12-15) forming a polysilicon film 14 by LPCVD at a temperature of about 550-650° C using PH<sub>3</sub> gas and a silicon source gas, to a thickness of about 1000-4000 Angstroms. Sung et al '453 teaches (at col 3, lines 59-65) forming a polysilicon film 6 by LPCVD using PH<sub>3</sub> gas and a silane source gas, to a thickness of about 500-1000 Angstroms. Dong teaches (at paragraph 35-36) forming a polysilicon film by LPCVD at a temperature of about 510-550° C using PH<sub>3</sub> gas and a SiH<sub>4</sub> or Si<sub>2</sub>H<sub>6</sub> source gas, to a thickness of about 500-1000 Angstroms, at pressure of 0.1 to 0.3 Torr.

Therefore, the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform the polysilicon film of the references including Wu by selecting the portion of the prior art's range of thickness, pressure, temperature, gases, as disclosed by Sung '078 and Sung et al '453, and/or Dong, which is within the range of applicant's claims, because it has been held to be obvious to select a value in a known range by optimization for the best results, and would be an unpatentable modification, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation". *In Re Aller* 104 USPQ

233,255 (CCPA 1955); *In re Waite* 77 USPQ 586 (CCPA 1948); *In Re Swanson* 56 USPQ 372 (CCPA 1942); and *In Re Dreyfus* 24 USPQ 52 (CCPA 1934).

***Response to Amendment***

13. Applicant's remarks filed July 24, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and in moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant remarked (7/24/06 remark page 7) that "...Wu does not teach or suggest the step of performing an ion implantation process on the active region to compensate for the ions for controlling a threshold voltage, which are diffused from the active region...".

In response, this is noted and found unconvincing. As clearly shown in Figures 3C-3D, Wu clearly teach performing an ion implantation process on the active region to compensate for the ions for controlling a threshold voltage, which ions are diffused from the active region, inherently, during the step of during the step of thermally growing the sidewall oxidation film 105 (Figure 3D; paragraph 0016). There is no difference between the claimed active region on which ions are implanted for controlling a threshold voltage from Wu's the active region on which ions are implanted for controlling a threshold voltage. In Wu, as shown in Figures 3C-3D, a region located under both the pad oxide layer 101a and the extended buffer spacers 104a is considered as an active region, wherein ions implanted at region 102c compensate for ions which are diffused from the active region during thermally growing the oxide film 105. Claimed subject matter, not the specification, is the measure of invention. Limitations in the specification cannot be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding the prior art. *In Re Self*, 213 USPQ 1,5 (CCPA 1982); *In Re Priest*, 199 USPQ 11,15 (CCPA 1978).

\*\*\*\*\*

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2822

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

\*\*\*\*\*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael M. Trinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-1847. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 9:00 Am to 5:30 Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zandra Smith can be reached on (571) 272-2429. The central fax phone number is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Oacs-15



Michael Trinh  
Primary Examiner